

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 were pending in the application. The applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 1-35. The Office action rejected claims 36-40 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over van Hal et al. (United States Patent No. 6,658,134) in view of Brandt (United States Patent No. 6,738,490), Button (United States Patent No. 5,828,767), Chen (United States Patent No. 5,124,681), Toki (United States Patent No. 5,858,154), or Takashi (Japan Patent Application Publication 10-032897). The applicant responds as follows.

SECTION 103(a) REJECTIONS

With respect to the rejection of claim 36, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. The examiner notes that the claim does not recite any benefit or purpose to the claimed alternate construction. Claim 36 has been amended to recite, in part, “wherein a space between individual turns is between three times and six times the thickness of the wire, for reducing parasitic capacitance.” The amendment is supported in the specification at least at paragraph 0020. Neither the van Hal nor the Brandt references teach or suggest coil windings having a space between individual turns between three and six times the thickness of the wire. The combination of van Hal and Brandt do not teach all the limitations of amended claim 36.

Further, there is no suggestion to combine the references. While, as the examiner points out, capacitive effects are well known, neither reference teaches or suggests that a reduction in parasitic capacitance is desirable, nor does either reference describe or suggest varying winding spacing as a means for affecting parasitic capacitance. The Federal Circuit has repeatedly reinforced the requirement for a suggestion to combine references in making a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 USC § 103(a). For example, *Ecolchem Inc. v. Southern California Edison*, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1065 (Fed. Cir. 2000) and *In re Dembiczak*, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Because the references alone or in

combination do not teach all the limitations of claim 36 and because there is no suggestion to combine the references, the rejection of claim 36 should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 37, the claim has been amended to recite, in part, “wherein a gap between adjacent winding modules is less than 5% of the width of one of the plurality of winding modules,” as supported in the specification at ¶ 0021. Neither Button nor van Hal recites the limitation of the gap between adjacent winding modules is less than 5% the width of the one of the windings. Because the references, separately or in combination do not teach all the limitations of amended claim 37, the rejection of claim 37 should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 38, the claim has been amended to recite, in part, “an end portion formed by a first plurality of individual turns originating at a point adjacent the tunnel and expanding radially outwardly to form an isosceles-triangle shaped boundary layer.” An electroacoustic receiver in accordance with the current disclosure has a boundary layer winding, as shown in Fig. 4 having successive layers wound touching the two adjacent wires beneath, forming an isosceles triangle. The boundary layer winding of Chen has successive winding layers of winding on top of the previous single wire, forming an equilateral triangle. Van Hal is silent on winding a boundary layer.

Further, there is no suggestion to combine the van Hal and Chen references. The Chen reference is directed to prevention of arcing in high voltage transformers. There is nothing in either the Chen or van Hal references to suggest reduction of parasitic capacitance is desirable, nor that such a boundary layer might be useful for controlling parasitic capacitance as claimed. For at least the reason that no combination of the references teaches all the limitations of claim 38 and because there is no motivation to combine the cited references, the rejection of claim 38 should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 39, the claim has been amended to recite, in part, “the coil comprising a first insulated wire winding layer, a second insulated wire winding layer, and an insulating layer wherein the insulating layer is positioned between the first and second

winding layers.” This amendment is supported at least at paragraph 0031 and by Fig. 7. The coil wire must be insulated to allow winding in contacted layers as shown and described. The windings of Toki are sheets of uninsulated conductors, a “multi-layer coil using electroconductive flexible sheets” (Col.1, line 59). Because neither van Hal nor Toki teach the use of an insulting layer between first and second insulated winding layers, the rejection of claim 39 should be withdrawn.

Claim 40 has been amended to recite, in part, that the coil has “coil comprising a plurality of layers having a plurality of alternating turns of conductive material and non-conductive material.” The van Hal reference does not teach or suggest alternating turns of conductive material and non-conductive material. The Takashi reference has a conducting layer printed on the surface of a bobbin sheet and a heat-resisting resin thinly coated over the pattern (abstract). The Takashi reference does not teach or suggest alternating turns of conductive material and non-conductive material. As the examiner states, the Takashi coil has an insulator between the conductors, but Takashi does not have alternating turns of either conductive or non-conductive material. The Takashi technique, with a printed layer of conductor, cannot be extended to multiple layers as recited in amended claim 40. Neither van Hal nor Takashi, separately or in combination, teach or suggest a plurality of layers having alternating turns of conductive and non-conductive material. Therefore, separately of in combination, the references do not teach or suggest all the elements of the claim. Therefore, the rejection of amended claim 40 should be withdrawn.

By way of the above amendments and arguments, the applicant believes all the claims are in condition for immediate allowance and such action is requested. No fees are believed due, but should a fee be required, the Commissioner is directed to Deposit Account 13-2855.

Dated: May 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Anthony G. Sitko

Registration No.: 36,278

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Agent for Applicant